

Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of the names *Phymaturus* Gravenhorst, 1837 and *Lacerta palluma* Molina, 1782 (currently *Phymaturus palluma*; Reptilia, Sauria) by designation of a neotype for *Lacerta palluma* (Case 3225; see BZN 60: 38–41, 58, 313–314)

(1) Darrel Frost

*Division of Vertebrate Zoology, American Museum of Natural History,
Central Park West at 79th Street, New York, NY 10024–5192, U.S.A.*

I support this application. The lizard in question has a substantial literature outside of systematics and so stabilizing the name *Phymaturus palluma* will have a salutary effect on communication among biologists.

(2) Richard Etheridge and Jay M. Savage

*Department of Biology, San Diego State University, San Diego,
California 92182–4614, U.S.A.*

In response to the comments by Veloso et al. in BZN 60: 313–314, we make the following comments. The facts relating to the various names in this case are not at issue. However, *Phymaturus palluma* and *Callopistes maculatus* were consistently and universally applied in the manner supported by our proposal from 1837 until 1985, as acknowledged by Veloso et al. in the first paragraph of their comment to the Commission. As their remaining remarks make clear, the 1985 paper by Cei & Lescure (see also Lescure & Cei, 1991; Veloso et al., 2000) ushered in a two decade period of instability in the previous long accepted usage of the involved names. In contrast, our proposal contributes to stability by preserving over 150 years of prevailing usage by unambiguously establishing the application of the generic and specific names to those taxa with which they have been long associated.

Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of the specific name *Palaeortyx phasianoides* Milne-Edwards, 1869 (Aves, Galliformes) by the designation of a neotype (Case 3266; see BZN 60: 211–214)

(1) Bradley C. Livezey

*Section of Birds, Carnegie Museum of Natural History, 4400 Forbes Avenue,
Pittsburg, PA 15213–4080, U.S.A.*

I fully support this application.

(2) Zlatozar Boev

*Fossil and Recent Birds Department, National Museum of Natural History,
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1 Blvd. Tsar Osvoboditel, 1000 Sofia, Bulgaria*

I support this application.

(3) Zygmunt Bochenski

*Institute of Systematics and Evolution of Animals, Polish Academy of Sciences,
31-016 Krakow, Slawkowska 17, Poland*

I support this application.

(4) Peter Ballmann

Am Nordpark 1b, 50733 Köln, Germany

I recommend that this petition to the Commission be accepted without amendments.

(5) Gareth Dyke

Department of Zoology, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland

I totally agree that the usage of the name *Palaeortyx phasianoides* should be maintained in the ornithological literature by the designation of a neotype. Confusion surrounding this issue has been needlessly created by Mlíkovský (2000) and is clearly based on misidentifications and taxonomic inaccuracies. This action will go far to avoid further confusion with regard to the nominal species *Palaeortyx phasianoides* (Gruiformes), *Mionetta blanchardi* (Milne-Edwards, 1863) (Anseriformes) and *Ameripodius alexis* Mourer-Chauviré, 2000 (Galliformes).

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Vespertilio nanus* Peters, 1852 (currently *Pipistrellus nanus*; Mammalia, Chiroptera)
(Case 3240; see BZN 60: 42–44, 314–315)

Dieter Kock

*Forschungsinstitut Senckenberg, Senckenberg-Anlage 25, D-60325 Frankfurt am Main,
Germany*

I do not support the application to suppress the name *Vespertilio pipistrellus africanus* Rüppell, 1842 for the African banana bat. This taxon as currently understood is apparently not monotypic as documented by published research work. Until a comprehensive revision of the complex has been achieved, untimely nomenclatural actions are liable to create further instabilities.